



MCG00215

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

: Date: July 8, 2002

Reinold et al.

Serial No.: 09/071,046

: Group Art Unit: 2611

Filed: April 29, 1998

: Examiner: Bui, Krista

Technology Center 2600

JUL 17 2002

RECEIVED

For: **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR DISTRIBUTING DIGITAL AUDIO AND VIDEO TO AN ANALOG WIRELINE DEVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, ON: July 8, 2002

Date of Deposit

MOTOROLA INC.

Name of Assignee

SIGNATURE

DATE

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,
Washington, D.C. 20231

SIR:

Please consider the following Brief on Appeal for the above identified patent application assigned to Motorola, Inc.

07/19/2002 BALEXAND 00000001 134772 09071046

01 FC:120 320.00 CH

I. **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The subject application is assigned to Motorola, Inc., the real party of interest.

EH

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

To Appellants' knowledge, there are no related appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

1. A copy of claims 1-30, the claims on appeal, are provided in Appendix A.
2. Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549).
3. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-19 and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394) and Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,045).
4. Claims 7-8, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394) and Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,045) and in further view of Schulhof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,979).

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS FILED SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL REJECTION

No response has been mailed subsequent to the final rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention is directed to a system and method of distributing audio and/or video content of a digital audio and/or video signal respectively to an analog wireline device (page 3, lines 22-30, FIG.1). An audio input interface (122) receives a digital audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifies an audio bitstream, where the audio bitstream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources (page 9, lines 5-24). Further, an audio decoding

unit decodes the audio bitstream (page 10, lines 19-20), and an audio digital-to-analog converter converts the audio bitstream to an analog audio signal (page 11, lines 1-2). Thereafter an audio output interface (128) distributes the analog audio signal to an analog wireline device (100) (FIG.5, page 14, lines 1-27).

A video input interface (142) receives a digital video signal from a plurality of sources and identifies a video bitstream, where the video bitstream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources (page 11, line 17 to page 12, line 5). Further, a video decoding unit decodes the video bitstream (page 13, lines 1-2), and a video digital-to-analog converter converts the video bitstream to an analog video signal (page 13, lines 17-18). Thereafter a video output interface (148) distributes the analog video signal to an analog wireline device (100) (FIG.5, page 14, lines 1-27).

VI. ISSUES

Whether claims 3 and 11 are anticipated by Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Further, whether claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-19 and 21-30 are unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394) and Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,045) under 35 U.S.C. §103. Further, whether claims 7-8, 15 and 20 are unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394) and Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,045) and in further view of Schulhof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,979) under 35 U.S.C. §103.

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

Appellants offer no other grouping of claims.

VIII. ARGUMENTS

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549, hereinafter called Kostreski et al.).

Claim 3 is dependent from independent claim 1, and claim 11 is dependent from independent claim 9. Appellants' independent claim 1 calls for, among other things, *receiving an audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio bitstream comprising audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*. Since claim 3 is dependent upon claim 1, claim 3 also has these limitations. Appellants' independent claim 9 calls for, among other things, *receiving a video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a video bitstream comprising video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*. Since claim 11 is dependent from claim 9, claim 11 also has these limitations.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. Of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). MPEP § 2131. Contrary to Examiner's assertion that all elements are disclosed in Kostreski et al., Appellants' claimed elements including: *receiving an audio and/or video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources* are not disclosed in Kostreski et al., so the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In fact, in the Office Action dated June 4, 2002 (Office Action), the Examiner states on page 4, first paragraph under the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection that "Kostreski does not clearly show that the digital audio signal is received "from a plurality of sources" as amended." The Examiner goes on to state in the second paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action that "Kostreski and Schein do not clearly further disclose the step of wherein the audio bit stream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to a plurality of sources." The Examiner further states on page 6 of the Office Action that "Kostreski and Schein do not clearly show that the digital video signal is received "from a plurality of sources" as amended." The Examiner still further states on page 7 of the Office Action that "Kostreski and Schein do not clearly show the step of wherein the video bit stream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to a plurality of sources." Since Kostreski et al. does not have the claimed limitations of *receiving an audio and/or video signal from a plurality of*

sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources, as affirmed by the Examiner, Kostreski et al. cannot anticipate Appellants' independent claims 1 and 9, or Appellants' dependent claims 3 and 11. Therefore, Appellants' respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-19 and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394, hereinafter called Schein et al.) and Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,045, hereinafter called Ozkan et al.).

Claims 7-8, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,549) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394) and Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,045) and in further view of Schulhof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,979, hereinafter called Schulhof et al.).

It is incumbent upon the Examiner to prove a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2143). To establish a *prima facie* case three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference.

1 - The combination does not provide Appellants' claimed invention.

Appellants' independent claims 1, 16, 21 and 29, call for, among other things, *receiving an audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio bitstream comprising audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*. Appellants' independent claims 9, 16, 25 and 29 call for, among other things, *receiving a video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a video bitstream comprising video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*. The cited references of Kostreski et al, Schein et al., Ozkan et al. and Schulhof et al. do not teach or suggest these features.

Kostreski et al. teaches a specific encoding method and a broadband network providing substantially concurrent distribution of multiple RF channels from separately located transmitters or sources which broadcast the same multi-channel multi-program

signal (column 1, lines 16-20, column 11, lines 58-63). The “sources” in Kostreski et al. refer to signals from separate transmitters, which are simultaneously broadcasting the same program, where the program is from a single source. Kostreski et al. teaches encoding using “a” standardized digitization and compression technique, such as MPEG “or” DIGICIPHER, with the preferred embodiment being MPEG II. Clearly, Kostreski et al. teaches the use of only one encoding method and not a plurality of encoding methods. Kostreski et al. teaches the use of the MPEG encoding method only, which is illustrated in FIG. 8 where MPEG audio and video decoders (129 and 131) are used. Kostreski et al. does not teach or suggest data from a plurality of sources where the data is based on a plurality of encoding methods *corresponding* to the plurality of sources.

Ozkan et al. teaches a method of forming program guide information suitable for *broadcast* in variable broadcast encoding formats (abstract). Ozkan et al. goes on to teach formatting and decoding video data in multiple encoding formats from a single source (having multiple channels) by forming a Master Program Guide (MPG) to associate a channel map with an encoding format (column 2, lines 17-29). The MPG and video data are incorporated into the video datastream and the datastream is provided to an output channel (abstract). Ozkan et al. further teaches that the channel map and MPG data permit identification of data packets, that comprise individual programs in different broadcast encoding formats from the single source video datastream, and permit decoding at the receiving end of the packets (column 10, lines 15-21). The different channel mappings from the single source transmission are associated with different broadcast encoding formats based on the available transmission bandwidth for a particular encoding format (column 6, lines 45-55). Variable encoding formats are used to selectively provide enhanced levels of broadcast signal noise immunity for a single source signal to manage the bandwidth being used for program content transmission (column 6, lines 50-55).

Since Ozkan et al. uses a Master Program Guide (MPG) to encode and decode the video datastream, Ozkan et al. is limited to *broadcast* from a single source only, as the encoding of the various channels of the video signal must be managed through incorporation into the single MPG. Although the broadcast may contain different channels, all of the channels ultimately originate at a single source so as to have the associated MPG created for later channel decoding. In other words, *Ozkan et al. is clearly limited to a single source transmission only, with a datastream broadcast in*

varying encoding formats along with an MPG to facilitate later decoding. Ozkan et al. relies on the MPG tied to the single source broadcast, to decode the channels associated with the single source broadcast. The Appellants' invention as disclosed and claimed has no such limitations. Ozkan et al. does not teach or suggest receiving data from a plurality of sources where the data is based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to a plurality of sources. In other words, since Ozkan et al. does not teach a plurality of sources, but merely a single source with multiple channels, Ozkan et al. cannot possibly teach receiving data from a plurality of sources where the data is based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources.

Schein et al. teaches a method for providing television schedule information to a viewer, and allowing the viewer to interact with schedule information in a remote database (abstract). Schein et al. goes on to teach the incorporation of an interactive computer system to assist a television viewer in utilizing television schedule information and linking with a database to search, retrieve and initiate a subscription to information. Although Schein et al. discloses receiving audio and video signals from a variety of sources (column 2, lines 37-65), Schein et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest anything about a plurality of sources having *data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*. In fact, Schein et al. *only* teaches that signals are received as an analog signal using the NTSC standard or as a digital signal modulated into an analog carrier as is well known in the art.

Schulhof et al. teaches a portable digital audio playback module for digital audio file receipt and storage, D/A conversion and payback (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 1). Schulhof et al. does not disclose or teach *receiving an audio and/or video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*.

In the Office Action dated June 4, 2002 (Office Action), the Examiner states on page 4, first paragraph under the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection that “Kostreski does not clearly show that the digital audio signal is received “from a plurality of sources” as amended.” The Examiner goes on to state in the second paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action that “Kostreski and Schein do not clearly further disclose the step of wherein the audio bit stream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to a plurality of sources.” The Examiner further states on page 6 of the Office Action that “Kostreski and Schein do not clearly show that the digital video signal is received “from a

plurality of sources” as amended.” The Examiner still further states on page 7 of the Office Action that “Kostreski and Schein do not clearly show the step of wherein the video bit stream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to a plurality of sources.”

As discussed above, neither Ozkan et al. or Schulhof et al. make up for the deficiencies in the Kostreski et al. and Schein et al. In other words, Kostreski et al. and Schein et al. do not disclose or teach *receiving an audio and/or video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*, as acknowledged by the Examiner in the June 4, 2002 Office Action. Ozkan et al. merely teaches the use of a Master Program Guide (MPG) to encode and decode a video datastream with multiple channels that necessarily originates from a single source. Schulhof et al. is related to the field of enhancing the delivery of audio data and does not teach or suggest the Appellants’ claimed invention. In other words, neither Ozkan et al. or Schulhof et al. disclose, teach or suggest *receiving an audio and/or video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*.

It is respectfully pointed out that the limitation of the receiving an audio and/or video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources is not found in the cited art and that functional claim language must be considered in evaluating a claim relative to the prior art. Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Barient, Inc., 827 F.2d 744 (Fed. Cir. 1987); Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp., 724 F.2d 951 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The PTO is not permitted to ignore the results and advantages produced by claimed subject matter, of which the prior art is devoid, simply because the claim limitations are similar to that otherwise found in the prior art. Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc., 850 F.2d 675 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Chupp, 816 F.2d 643 (Fed. Cir. 1987); Fromson v. Advanced Offset Plate, 755 F.2d 1549 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1984); Carl Schenck, A.G. v. Nortron Corp., 713 F.2d 782 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Appellants’ respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29 as drafted clearly distinguish over the cited art. In particular, neither Kostreski et al., Ozkan et al., Schein et al. nor Schulhof et al. disclose or teach receiving an audio and/or

video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a bitstream comprising audio and/or video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources. Kostreski et al., Ozkan et al., Schein et al. and Schulhof et al., individually or in combination, do not contain at least these features of the Appellants' claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29, they do not include all of the elements of Appellants' independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29, and therefore cannot anticipate Appellants' independent claims. Therefore, Appellants' respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

2 - There is no motivation or suggestion contained in the cited art to combine the teachings of the references.

Before obviousness may be established, the Office Action *must show specifically* the principle, known to one of ordinary skill that suggests the claimed combination. In re Lee, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002). In other words, the Examiner *must explain* the reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention. Id. The factual question of motivation is material to patentability and *cannot be resolved based on subjective belief and unknown authority*. Id. at 1344. Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572 at 1577. The critical inquiry is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole *to suggest* the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination. Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate, 755 F.2d 1549 at 1556.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Kostreski et al., Ozkan et al., and Schein et al. to arrive at the Appellants' claimed invention. Appellants' respectfully submit that these statements are unsupported assertions expressing *conclusions* and as such are *not* reasons for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Moreover, the test for obviousness must come from, or at least be compatible with, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), stating that: " . . . if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that *the subject matter as a whole* would have been obvious . . ." (emphasis added; 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)). The Office Action's unsupported assertions at most address obviousness of a *difference* between the

claimed subject matter and the prior art, and not obviousness of the *claimed subject matter as a whole*, as required by the plain language of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The rejection in question can only be based upon a hindsight reconstruction enlightened by Appellants' own disclosure. As the CAFC stated in W.L Gore Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc. (220 USPQ 303, 312-13 (Fed. Cir. 1983)):

To imbue one of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the invention in suit, where no prior art reference or references of record convey or suggest that knowledge, is to fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher.

The Examiner has failed to show either a suggestion in the art or a compelling motivation based on sound scientific principles to combine the references and therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn. Appellants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion to combine the references, and if they could be properly combined, do not lead to the Appellants' invention.

Claims 2-8 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Claims 17-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Claims 22-24 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 26-28 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 25 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 25.

Claim 30 depends directly from claim 29 and is believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 29.

Appellants therefore pray for the reversal of the final rejection and the allowance of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,
Reinold et al.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin D. Wills". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kevin" and last name "Wills" clearly distinguishable.

Kevin D. Wills
Agent for Appellants
Reg. No. 43,993
Tel. (602) 952-4362

MOTOROLA, INC.
Corporate Law Department
3102 North 56th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85018

IX. APPENDIX A

1. (Twice Amended) A system for distributing audio content of a digital audio signal to a analog wireline device, comprising:

an audio input interface receiving the digital audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

an audio decoding unit connected to the audio input interface and decoding the audio bitstream;

an audio digital to analog converter connected to the audio decoding unit and converting the audio bitstream to an analog audio signal; and

an audio output interface connected to the audio digital to analog converter and distributing the analog audio signal to the analog wireline device.

2. The system of claim 1, further comprising an audio digital decryption unit connected to the audio input interface and decrypting the audio bitstream.

3. The system of claim 1, further comprising an audio analog decryption unit connected to the audio digital to analog converter and decrypting the analog audio signal.

4. The system of claim 1 wherein the audio output interface distributes the analog audio signal to multiple devices.

5. The system of claim 1 wherein the audio input interface receives the digital audio signal from a network.

6. The system of claim 1 wherein the audio input interface receives the digital audio signal from a local storage device.

7. The system of claim 1 wherein the audio input interface receives the digital audio signal produced by a text-to-speech application.

8. The system of claim 1 wherein the audio input interface receives the digital audio signal produced by a digital musical instrument.

9. (Twice Amended) A system for distributing video content of a digital video signal to an analog wireline device, comprising:

a video input interface receiving the digital video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a video bitstream, wherein the video bitstream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

a video decoding unit connected to the video input interface and decoding the video bitstream;

a video digital to analog converter connected to the video decoding unit and converting the video bitstream to an analog video signal; and

a video output interface connected to the video digital to analog converter and distributing the analog video signal to the analog wireline device.

10. The system of claim 9, further comprising a video digital decryption unit connected to the video input interface and decrypting the video bitstream.

11. The system of claim 9, further comprising a video analog decryption unit connected to the video digital to analog converter and decrypting the analog video signal.

12. The system of claim 9 wherein the video output interface distributes the analog video signal to multiple devices.

13. The system of claim 9 wherein the video input interface receives the digital video signal from a network.

14. The system of claim 9 wherein the video input interface receives the digital video signal from a local storage device.

15. The system of claim 9 wherein the video input interface receives the digital video signal produced by a digital video camera.

16. (Twice Amended) A system for distributing audio and video content of a digital audio signal and a digital video signal to an analog wireline device, comprising:

an audio input interface receiving the digital audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

an audio decoding unit connected to the audio input interface and decoding the audio bitstream;

an audio digital to analog converter connected to the audio decoding unit and converting the audio bitstream to an analog audio signal;

an audio output interface connected to the audio digital to analog converter and distributing the analog audio signal to the analog wireline device;

a video input interface receiving the digital video signal from the plurality of sources and identifying a video bitstream, wherein the video bitstream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

a video decoding unit connected to the video input interface and decoding the video bitstream;

a video digital to analog converter connected to the video decoding unit and converting the video bitstream to an analog video signal;

a video output interface connected to the video digital to analog converter and distributing the analog video signal to the television; and

a synchronization unit connected to the audio output interface and the video output interface and synchronizing the analog audio signal and the analog video signal.

17. The system of claim 16, further comprising a splitter receiving a digital input signal and splitting the digital input signal into the digital audio signal and the digital video signal.

18. The system of claim 16 wherein the video input interface receives the digital video signal from a network.

19. The system of claim 16 wherein the video input interface receives the digital video signal from a local storage device.

20. The system of claim 19 wherein the video input interface receives the digital video signal produced by a digital video camera.

21. (Twice Amended) A method for distributing audio content of a digital audio signal to an analog wireline device, comprising the steps of:

receiving the digital audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

decoding the audio bitstream;

converting the audio bitstream to an analog audio signal; and

distributing the analog audio signal to the analog wireline device.

22. The method of claim 21, further comprising the steps of decrypting the audio bitstream.

23. The method of claim 21, further comprising the steps of decrypting the analog audio signal.

24. The method of claim 21 wherein the step of decoding the audio bitstream includes decompressing the audio bitstream.

25. (Twice Amended) A method for distributing video content of a digital video signal to an analog wireline device, comprising the steps of:

receiving the digital video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a video bitstream, wherein the video bitstream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

decoding the video bitstream;

converting the video bitstream to an analog video signal; and

distributing the analog video signal to the analog wireline device.

26. The method of claim 25, further comprising the steps of decrypting the video bitstream.

27. The method of claim 25, further comprising the steps of decrypting the analog video signal.

28. The method of claim 25 wherein the step of decoding the video bitstream includes decompressing the video bitstream.

29. (Twice Amended) A method for distributing audio and video content of a digital audio signal and a digital video signal to an analog wireline device, comprising the steps of:

- receiving the digital audio signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

- decoding the audio bitstream;

- converting the audio bitstream to an analog audio signal;

- receiving the digital video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying a video bitstream, wherein the video bitstream comprises video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources;

- decoding the video bitstream;

- converting the video bitstream to an analog video signal; and

- distributing the analog audio signal and the analog video signal to the analog wireline device.

30. The method of claim 29, further comprising the steps of:

- receiving a digital input signal as an integrated digital input signal; and

- splitting the digital input signal into the digital audio signal and the digital video signal.